

**IF YOU LIKE THESE VIDEOS, YOU CAN MAKE A SMALL DONATION VIA PAYPAL or BITCOIN LINKS HERE:**

[https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr?cmd=\\_s-xclick&hosted\\_button\\_id=BDZ3G8SJ4ABT4](https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr?cmd=_s-xclick&hosted_button_id=BDZ3G8SJ4ABT4)

(Paypal email: [kenw111@insightbb.com](mailto:kenw111@insightbb.com))

MY BITCOIN: 19WnEPwjRHnnfiDpVFUni1A2Amqvxy4gud

PATREON: <https://www.patreon.com/angryphotographer>

## *On the profanity called Atheism* **copyright Ken Wheeler**

The profane and pathetic nature of Atheism does not stem from its denial of a Creationist God, but as the Greek term itself defines same, *atheos* (anti-divinity) is a materialistic denial of all things metaphysical. This demonic Physicalism, or Atheism, derives its status amongst most as merely a vehement denial of God, however the case is that an Atheist is in true, a metaphysical Atheist who denies any immaterial and uncompounded Subjective principles as prior to, underneath or autonomous to matter (hyle).

The first mention of Atheism, is by the Greeks in the term *atheos*, which is in reference to Greek Platonism as refers to the *Nous* (will/mind/citta/spirit/soul) as found in passage: (**Phil 26e-30d**) and not to a supernatural persona, i.e. God. The immanent-only materialistic pantheism of metaphysical Atheism is an aphilosophical position holding that everything which exists is no more extensive than its physical compounded materiality; that is, that there are no kinds of things other than physical things. This anti-divinity of Atheism is the true and shadow-worshipping profanity that is the hallmark of Atheism, not its correct position that, as Plato and the Neoplatonists argued for as well, that there was no Supreme-Being as creator of the cosmos.

Metaphysical Atheism is Atheism, in true and in whole. That some who deem themselves Atheists also admit to, as they would say 'something' is certainly not in question, however these people are not in fact Atheists but lazy Agnostics and in most cases crypto-materialists; calling themselves atheists in but they merely deny God, is only a measure of their ignorance in of which they do not know the full scope of the very term Atheism. The Greeks in coining the term as progenitor for Atheism had meant, as Plato, Socrates, and Pythagoras before both, the denial of spiritual and immaterial divinity *a-theos*, or anti-divinitism.

Plotinus, the founder of Neoplatonism (only an extension and condensing of Platonism itself), wrote extensively on the denial of the Absolute as not Being, but an active insentient dynamis, an unmediated divinity of which composite Being could not be said thereof; such that Being by definition must partake of more than an uncompounded simplex principle (such as *nous*). The goal of Vedanta, Advaita, Buddhism (all of which encompass Upanishadic Monism) have Brahman as the end goal, of which this Absolute is most certainly denied as Being (i.e. God). Atheism in true is none other than materialism, the praise of the existential persona headed for the grave-pit, it cant be shown anything else but contempt for denial of any and all which is outside the scope of the narrow and fallible spectrum of the petty human senses. Gotama Buddha derided Ishvara (God) both in principle and those who aligned themselves in practice with same.

A voracious supporter of Atheism (not a mere God-denying agnostic as in the previous example) will in all instances adamantly deny the metaphysical, the divinity of which *atheos*, or Atheism is meant in its definition. A true agnostic (merely as meant agnosis, or ignorance! Or, deeming oneself as ignorant) is but an unlearned and unexplored supporter of metaphysics even if only indirectly; that some agnostics would foremostly deny God, does not make them an Atheist. That these 'unknowers' (agnostics) would firstly deem themselves as Atheists is but a further expression of their ignorance of the meaning of Atheism and not just of metaphysics.

Atheism is currently not a (sic) philosophical position that God is not, but that theology (again, the study of divinity, which Creationism is only a part thereof) is something to be despised and spit upon. To convince oneself of the insanity of Atheists, they need only watch a debate between Atheists and Creationists; one might gather that such rabid profanity-laced tirades could only be found amongst those made-become Atheists who had been raped over twenty years by Catholic priests. It is highly humorous that Atheists fight and spit so voraciously at the mention of a God whom they deny exists. In true definition further in modern connotation and example, Atheism is little more than anti-religiosity (theo-logy), and not simply the logical denial of God.

Religion is merely the profane secular side of metaphysics; is but popularized metaphysics; as such it is true that religion is as was said "the opiate of the masses". A modern Atheist is one who hisses like a snake at the sight of religious and or theological institutions of noetic, spiritual examination. He is, as Atheist, far more than one who denies the Creationists God(s); but were Atheism merely this alone, I and many others Platonists, Vedantists, would gladly proclaim themselves as Atheists! In connotation and definition both however to call oneself an Atheist is no different than gleefully calling oneself a demon materialist.

What the Atheists fail to realize is of the two ignorant positions as explanation for the extreme complexity in nature between the model of the Creationists, and that of the Atheists, the positions of the Atheists is far more so the implausible one. The extreme complexity in nature from macro to micro is not in question by even the lowliest of fools, however the Atheistic position that this complexity stems from time and random atomic convergence is highly ignoble and unintelligent. One might equally insanely postulate, from the same position of the Atheists, that random atoms, given a few billion years, will eventually coalesce to the point of creating Shakespearean literature. However Atheism in its extreme insanity is working on creating its own Gods, thru perfection of cryogenics and DNA manipulation wherein someday, they erroneously hope, will culminate in bodily immortality. Or even more insanely, as some demonic Atheists have postulated, that empirical consciousness is no more than complex and copyable network which could be transferred as software into a robot at the death of the body, thereby granting immortality in the form of a robot which could be repaired indefinitely. In the ranks of perversity, even Satanism hails as higher than Atheism, in that of its core Satanism admits to a full acknowledgement of immaterial and metaphysical subjectivity, or the divine, even if in praise of the dark side of divinity. Insanity takes countless forms, Atheism is but one highly miserable variety thereof.

## Part II on Atheism

### copyright Ken Wheeler

To the ignorant materialistic atheist, and possible expert in objective reality, the metaphysician must declare to such a one as him that “you, while competent in your myopic study of existential things, causes, effects and temporal phenomena; are wholly unschooled in the arena of metaphysics both in whole and in part and therefore should not step, like the proverbial fish out of water, into the denial and speculation upon Subjective metaphysics simply due to your myopic litmus test of rejecting anything both in whole or in part due to a lack of objective investigation into that thing. By logic alone, there is no measuring the Measurer nor is there objective proof for metaphysical subjects anymore so than there is objective proof of your love of your wife or mother.” It is the case that a proud materialist (metaphysical atheist) has made a sort of sick religion out of physicalism. It is ironic that Atheists in general will declare they “merely deny God/gods”, however this is almost never the case, for these same atheists also lump the soul, the Absolute and all uncompounded Subjective Beings, and the notion of a Subjective substrate to phenomena as “unreal, equally as asinine as God, etc.”. The irony lies not in their denial of God/gods, but their vociferous refusal to delve into their other rejection, that of metaphysical subjects; for them, if they are pressed, will equally and soundly denounce the soul and metaphysics as “equally insane voodoo on par with that of a creationist God”.

An atheist, while proudly (and correctly) proclaiming he denies God and or gods, is nearly 100% of the time also a metaphysical atheist; as is meant the denial of any and all uncompounded Subjects (the soul, and any insubstantial principles such as the Absolute etc.). Because these atheists almost always vehemently dismiss the existence of the metaphysical, they also dismiss metaphysics as the “pointless study of nothing”. Because metaphysics is technically the study of all reality, or rightly what is above (meta) physical existence, but most specifically the subjective (and the only real) reality of genuine Being. Metaphysics is the most fundamental subject which materialistic atheists should focus on but reject and deny any worth as pertains study thereof.

Ignorant atheists, like the logical positivists that most of them are, have argued that the agenda of metaphysics is largely pointless and can’t accomplish anything (material), which is of course true, however material and corporeal progression (be it invention, longer life etc.) is never, by definition, the goal of metaphysics and its study; as one fool-Atheist once proclaimed in his ignorance that “Sir Isaac Newton’s vast metaphysical writings yielding nothing (nothing physical/material) of value!”. According to these deluded atheists, metaphysical statements cannot be either true or false, as a result, they don’t really carry any meaning (‘tangible’ as meant phenomenal) and shouldn’t be given any serious consideration. There is of course justification to this ignorant position, but it is highly unlikely to impress religious theists, or metaphysician for whom metaphysical claims constitute the most important parts of their lives and the bliss that gnosis and wisdom bears fruit to in their scientific investigations. Absolute metaphysical atheists subscribe to some form of physicalism, of materialism, and hence they explicitly deny the existence of non-physical beings.

Atheists, in the profundity of their mental incompetence and impotency have lumped metaphysics into the arena of religious nonsense and ritualism. As is true the empty and absurdity as often found in and amongst all the worlds religions and its nonsensical self-sacrifice to the will and conformity of a supreme diety (Creationism in all forms). The Atheists has ignorantly declared religion and metaphysics to be equally absurd pursuits. However all religions are aught more than secular popularizations and misunderstandings of the metaphysicians of ancient, in such case the Atheist in this instance is right in his attack of “opium of the masses” that is religion both in whole and in part.

Almost all atheists tend to adopt a materialistic perspective on reality. This means that they regard the nature of our reality and the universe as consisting of matter and energy. Everything is natural; nothing is metaphysical (or as they say ‘supernatural’). From their myopic and limited sphere of human sense, here there are no supernatural beings, realms, or planes of existence and all cause and effect proceeds via natural laws, without an underlying substrate to phenomena.

Atheists generally fall into three categories, vociferous materialistic agnostics, materialistic objectivists, and Creationist-rejects. The vociferous materialistic agnostics are the mentally lazy non-investigative types who have grown up in an “irreligious” setting wherein, which nothing religious or metaphysical is ever discussed, and upon seeing the absurdity within and among Creationists, has ‘ripened’ (rather rotted) into the position of an atheist. The materialistic objectivist, not far from his brethren the vociferous materialistic agnostic, has grown up in, and the possible study in depth of, physical reality and the modern ‘cult of scientism’ which falsely proclaims either a cause, a chemical, or atomistic explanation for all totality, either seen or otherwise; these very same idiot-breeds of atheists are the worst in that they are typically college well-educated idiots who are fond speculators upon the field which is outside their arena of study and insight, often trying to pseudo-intelligently posit a cause or chain of causes and or chemistry for any topic of study or investigation, including that of consciousness itself. These very same materialistic objectivists are often scientists, doctors, engineers, chemists, biologists or other physicalist-specialists. The last and most unintelligent variety of Atheists are the Creationist-rejects, who have just enough intelligence to conclude that the religion of their upbringing is a giant illogical and laughable contradiction. These same types of atheists are often seen professing their profound hatred of the very same God they deny exists to begin with.

Atheism, in further laughable insanity, has built as its foundation and superstructure the logical, abductive and deductive reasonings of the likes of such greats as Plato, Pythagoras, Aristotle, the Greek Platonists, Galileo, Sir Isaac Newton and others. If one were to fall lockstep in line with the mental midgentry of Atheism, one might utterly forget that the vast corpus of writings and musings of all these greats in higher learning was in the arena of metaphysics exclusively. Of Sir Isaac Newton’s works alone, we know that more than 70% of his written works are in the arena of spiritual studies, metaphysics, and metaphysical ontology; and that his investigation and expertise into phenomenal reality was only for purpose of exposing his mind to the workings of the universe above and beyond the materialistic and experiential realm. The same is the case for Plato and the rest; yet Atheism proudly plants its flag upon the dead remains of these late great metaphysicians whose self-confessed purpose of study upon physical reality was merely and solely grounds for a deeper philosophical and metaphysical insight into the uncompounded and ‘spiritual’ Being which is not

objectively investigatable. Atheism itself, to its own ignorant unknowing, has become a type of religion in and unto itself; a sort of cult of physicalism, with the atom and the slide ruler as its temple, and the worship of corporeal purity and potential immortality (see cryonics, or cryogenic imperturbability) as having its locus in the temporal body of blood and bone. Of the idiocy that is Atheism and its myriad forms of materialistic absolutism, of them and their ignorant rejection of metaphysics it can be said, that their position is like the line from Hamlet which follows: "I see not, but all there is I do see!"

## **The Hidden Secrets Behind all True Mysticism Desperately Sought After by Many copyright Ken Wheeler**

**1 1 / 2 3 / 5 (Phi, Fibonacci, golden sequence) i.e. 1 1 2 3 5 8 13 etc. (however the mystical triad is complete by meeting the pentad)**

**Point 1, line 1, circle 2, sphere 3, life 5(animus)**

**(#1) Monad-1/Mind-1(nous, citta, spirit), (#2) Magnitude-2(space)/Matter-3(hyle), (#3) 'Man'-5(being, life, on [greek])...(the pentadic trinity and unknown secret held by the Pythagoreans)**

**1 divided by Phi to negative3 cubed = Phi cubed = Pan**

If you can understand the four points above, all four of which imply and explain the same thing (the One, Emanation, and totality), then you possess the greatest secret & hidden truth held so close by the Pythagoreans, Plato, and a very few others. To the common idiot (=skeptic, or atheist), this metaphysical symbolism is merely an existentialist mind screw puzzle, without meaning, reason, or logic (objectively so); and to him, has no more import than the subjective and multi-spectrum views held by any one of a thousand peoples about the "meaning of said piece of artwork". However nothing further from the truth could this be.

In both the supremely divine logic of Monism and that of Platonism (and Vedanta) that both come closest to illuminating the hidden nature of all reality, there is aught 'original sin', nor is there any first cause, there is no 'initial' impetus for the descent of spirit and henceforth embodiment of the spirit shackled to the slings and arrows of antinomies that necessitate (ananke) define empirical existence (exio + stance). The One, the supremely divine Absolute is neither being, nor sentient, nor itself/himself (as wrongly envisioned by Creationists) cause to point blame or any cause for all that comes after the One.

I might remind you of the secret (so to say) obvious, that the Pythagoreans and Platonists were not greatly fond of study of the golden section, ratios, and mathematics as an ends so as to be further learned in the science of nature (as is the case greatly so as exemplified by Aristotle), but as a means to grasp the logic of the metaphysics they knew to be most logical and true, that of Emanationism (proodos), and using said metaphysical arithmos as modeling out the wisdom gained in noetic contemplation, and using said proofs to compliment what they already understood. It is ONLY the case of the idiot, the atheist, the common dolt and 'boob' who is certain that "spirituality and metaphysics are neither logical, nor deductively reasonable". This position is, in today's world, a rampant and entirely prolific disease, mostly due the absence of metaphysics and supplanting of illogical religious systems in their place. The remaining cause for this common (=profane, or 'peoples') view is the advance of European empiricism and materialism in general.

I have, in the four points above, illustrated to you the absolutely most deep secrets that lie at the roots of all forms of genuine mysticism, but as much as you look at them, you will not grasp it, you will not 'see' (noesis) it, likely further you will reject it as twaddle, and nonsensical symbolic irrelevance. Revealed above is the divine trinity "which is also One", also revealed above is the arithmos of Emanationism itself. The four proofs above are universal throughout the entire cosmos from one end to the other, in every corner seen and unseen in the universe; from macro to micro and even beyond to ontological subjects in the realm of the cosmos noetos. The rules of Emanation hold true be they among metaphysical Subjects or among material and atomic objects, the only difference being the medium and compositional complexity (as above, so below).

The most profound secrets revealed in prolonged noesis (Samadhi states, epistrophe, synthesis, or the fruit of apophysis) are secrets so deep merely such that they take wisdom to comprehend them. For those however who grasp same, these secrets are not secrets whatsoever, and are so stunningly obvious, so incredibly simple, so unquestionable as to be even more simplex than the bodies unconscious impulse to inhale breath.

The Absolute, the One is so simple in nature as to be utterly beyond the reckoning of all but the profoundly wise; the simplicity of same is awe inspiring to those who have even but glimpsed same, and is only APPARENTLY 'profoundly secret and mystical' to the common man who cannot reckon the nature of anything other than material and objective reality. There is no complexity to or attributed alongside the One, but that the commoner cannot fathom same, it is for all intents and purposes, a genuine, profound, hidden, and dark secret; and more often than not outright rejected by the proliferation of metaphysical atheists/materialists today.

The 'great secrets' which illuminate the works of the Universe and the One, are in fact very simple, more simple in fact than would be a parts diagram of a post-it note. However even the most intellectual existentialist cannot unlock this secret without the key of wisdom, to which the door of revelation is utterly impervious to his conscious deductions.

# Ockham's razor, the Absolute, and the search for supreme truth

copyright Ken Wheeler

William of Ockham, famous for a take upon his statement that one should not multiply entities beyond necessity “Entia non sunt multiplicanda sine necessitate”; now known only as “Ockham’s razor” was a metaphysical conclusion taken upon himself from the Platonic texts to which he was oft to have studied. It is certainly true that Ockham’s position to wit that the only “true necessity was that of God; all else is a (compounded) contingency” is at least nearly correct, as taken from the position of his Creationist mentality which cannot be cleaved from Ockham’s error that the Absolute was a composite entity with self-sentence, i.e. God.

From this obviously untenable position it is of no surprise that “Ockham’s razor” is often wielded as an argument against a Creationist theos by the equally ignorant nihilists and metaphysical atheists who realize the incommensurate errors which lie at the heart of positing the Absolute as more than the essence of being, but rather a supreme being in and of itself, to which the Platonists are vociferously apposite. It is therefore ironic that Ockham himself was a Creationist merely well versed and agreed with the logical Monism as found in the Platonic texts to which he was well learned, save for subjective adaptation to fit into his God-model of cosmic mechanics.

Ockham was arguably important in physics for his view, apparently an application of his razor, that motion is essentially self-conserving in itself without need of any causal force to which it need be added that Monism’s very core denies a “first sin” or “original cause” for the descent of being into empirical entrapment. The great “secret”, for lack of better designation, of Emanationism (proodos) and Platonic Monism is that descent and embodiment are ananke (necessitated, unavoidable; choate principle and attribute of the Absolute itself) to which wisdom’s revelation invokes the divine insight in the seeker that what the Absolute “is” and what it “does” are without distinction, in whole or in part, and are one and the very same essence, that being nous, or spirit, will, or “mind” in the non-empirical sense. To which what spirit ‘is’ and its attribute (what it ‘does’) are without differentiation.

Rightly so, his skepticism to which his ontological divine-simplicity request leads, appears in his doctrine that human reason can prove neither the immortality of the soul nor the existence, unity, and infinity of God. These truths, he teaches, are known to us by noetic revelation alone; logically all empirical speculation and theories are objective consubstantial conscious machinations which can neither provide revelation or bring about assimilation, i.e. bring proximity of the spirit to itself.

“Ockham’s razor”, in summation, lays contrary to the Creationist-God of Ockham himself but equally and intensely so against that of the materialist-nihilist. Ignoring this nuance as defect in the engrained Abrahamic mentality of Ockham’s Euro-Christian mentality, his “razor” sits at the very cornerstone and foundation upon which Platonism, logic and truth are built. This divine edifice of Emanationist Monism to which Ockham himself is famous for, but which he merely rediscovered, is the “supreme simplicity” which is stunningly simplex, yet which composes the entire mechanics of Emanationism/Platonic Monism. All beauty and complexity in nature are based upon Phi or Phi composites and it is certainly no surprise this divine ratio (Phi is to 1, as 1 is to Phi; or that Phi and 1 are but both the same thing, one delineated, the other numerated principle) was center of much study by the Platonists and the Pythagoreans before them (and before them?...).

Given a great deal of sufficient wisdom (to which I am thankful to possess much) it must be stated that just beneath the ecstatic unspeakable and transcendent bliss of synthesis with the Absolute, this holy union of Self with Self/Absolute; second to this is the intense stupefaction one is blessed to ‘see’, as product of wisdom, the incredible simplicity, the necessity (“it cannot be another way”) of the mechanics of totality. The elimination internally of all of mankind’s most common and many metaphysical “whys” wiped for all eternity from ones soul, is a spiritual Kingship that cannot be described in any sense or relation to another. “Ockham’s razor” is merely a very late and rehashed statement attributed to William of Ockham as to his insights gleaned from his Platonic studies; just as all things known and unknown are, there is “nothing new under the sun, only things said and lost, and rediscovered and made new again”.

What is most important of this “razor” is that, unlike the nihilism of atheism and illogic of Creationism, Emanationism stands at the epicenter of abductive logic, of truth, of unspeakably divine simplicity, of incontrovertibility, as the undeniable model of totality and the cosmos both spiritual and material. Thereof the wise and fool alike are begged to take precious time to study and come to internally know (gnosis, not episteme) what is true and most beneficial. Just as the noble person kneels with bent head before the holy alter of wisdom (the same alter upon which the gods themselves also ‘sacrifice’) and which can bear one upon spiritual holistics, and the noetic righting of all former errors.

He who has not, before the alter of truth, vowed to sacrifice all to know what forever remains unknown to the common and profane many, shall not come to ‘see’ what leads to salvation and wisdom which transcends the antinomies of life and death; and which woefully perpetuates oneself thru eons of suffering and ignorance. Those super-rare wise become the unmarked and holy who cannot be counted or seen by the woes of this world and the demons who prey upon the helpless. They bear no debts or burdens; the children of ignorance are for them utterly gone for all eternity. Any who looks for such ones will only come upon a named body but never shall they find the Person who has been “wiped clean forever from the slate of birth and death”.

What abnormal stupefaction the wise are blessed with to have wisdom into the incredible simplicity behind the mechanics of all things. Truly it takes much wisdom to rise above the trees to see the forest and at once know beginning and end and all things tween’ both and marvel and rejoice in wisdom’s fruit which bears witness to such a profound revelation few else can fathom. The “razor” is not Ockham’s, nor the Platonists, but it is supremely true, is timeless, and revelation nonetheless; a paradigm the wise will nod to as acknowledgement of what they know as unquestionably accurate about the Absolute.



# **The Relativism fallacy against Metaphysics**

## ***Or, the “all truth is relative” fallacy as premise for dismissing metaphysical truths/absolutes by the unintelligent***

### **copyright Ken Wheeler**

As is commonly encountered by those forwarding metaphysical principles either as pertaining to the model of the Absolute or the methodology for ascent from embodiment to noetic assimilation, the profane counter to any logical claim thereof or otherwise, is that “truth is subjective (empirically so)”, or that “that’s your version of the truth, which is relative”. The superimposition and implication, as countered by the unintelligent who knows only of existential being and life, is that since all spacio-temporal references and perspectives are indeed relative and therefore empirically subjective (personalized), therefore too is any model of totality, of metaphysical principles as pertaining to noetic uncompounded Subjectivity (Soul, nous, the Absolute, citta etc.) as forwarded by any and all branches of metaphysics, i.e. Platonism, any form of Monism, Advaita, proto-Buddhism, Vedanta in general.

In the analogy of a large east-facing building at daybreak, one observer taking perspective truth-sampling of and about the building from the eastern side, and yet another similar observer from the western unlit side, there will be diametrically opposed empirical truths about the attributes of the building. For instance the eastern facing observer taking note of the orange hues of the morning sun sparkling across the windows and stone frame would relate and provide the truth to the subjective personal beauty he finds of said building, whereas the western observer would have an entirely different subjective perspective and equally valid truth as to the aesthetic beauty of said building, or lack thereof in his situation/space, being that it is unlit, it is therefore dark, dismal, depressing in appearance, etc. The fallacy of the unintelligent manyfolk, the profane and myopic materialist who has neither idea nor acknowledgement of the noetic (pali: puthujjana) is association of the absolute truth that all empirical and spacio-temporal sensory-datum, perspectives, experiences, feelings, and even existential consciousnesses which are relative, which are personal, therefore equally so apply to metaphysics by his reckoning and faulty deduction; nothing is further from the truth in regards to same. No branch of metaphysics uses employs, or trusts any aspect of personal consubstantial sensory data as the grounds, basis, or axis mundi for its expression of the truth, and rightly so. Some peoples stricken with sensory maladies or temporary sicknesses may, for example, experience sweet things as sour, or as has been recorded, some brains miswired from birth are capable of smelling colors, or seeing sounds etc. There is utterly no escaping the unreckonable variety of experiences of any one thing, much less many phenomenal things by and large. This is the realm of unlimit and antinomy; however Metaphysics deals with the study of limit (the One) and ontological Subjectivity which is substrate and posterior to any and all antinomies.

The unintelligent and profane common-man in the myopic logic which extends no further than his faulty senses is correct, from his perspective (rather lack thereof), to wit that metaphysics would not be outside of the scope of any other phenomenal and subjective truth, as in the case of the two observers; however he would be utterly wrong. This fallacious presumption is the very core reason why a genuine metaphysical/philosophical truth seeker is one of the most rare and endangered breeds of human-beings which exists. From the fallacious conjecture of the materialist, the only criterion there can be are the meager (and profane) senses, and since, from common knowledge, this is subjective and utterly relative, therefore the quest for unwavering Absolutes, of simplex ontological principles is a hopeless endeavor at best, even if said profane person were to admit to the possibility of same existence, to wit acknowledging as is commonly found the man who believes in the “higher, the spiritual”, but utterly denies the truth of same could be unraveled or exposed since it would not be a universal truth in discovery, but a small and relative one of personal subjectivity. That “nothing is known except thru the modality (language, communication, expressions etc.) of the Knower” is indeed true, as such metaphysical expositions in 100% agreement with each other (such as Platonism and Advaita and proto-Buddhism being in full agreement with each other on the Absolute and ascent to same) use different terminology, and nuances specific to both place and time (greek and Europe vs. Sanskrit and India, for example) to empirically illuminate, express, and relate the nature of metaphysics, of ascension, of the Absolute in the lexicon of both the place, and the time of said metaphysician. This, unfortunately, adds an additional false-confirmation to the myopic materialist who wrongly demonstrates that three identical systems of metaphysics appear (superficially so) radically different in both description and teaching in relation to the instructed, the disciple of said system. Or worse still additionally that that nuance is magnified as it passes from an alien and ancient dead language into modern translation of a commoners tongue which may and often does lack to a great degree the nuance and lexicon needed to relate subtle principles to the mind of the reader.

Returning to the analogy of the building and the two observers attempting to subjectively relate the aesthetics etc. truth of the building from their spacio and sensory perspectives (both of which, in conjunction, reinforce the incorrect notion that truth is unquestionably relative); we then take both men from their relative outside positions, to then inside the building, and eliminate the existential senses of both, since metaphysics takes no stock or basis in same concerning the logic, and noetic Truth-gnosis of metaphysical Subjects and uncompounded Being (Atman, spiritus sanctum, etc.). From said position both men, by means of the noetic mind (nous, citta, spirit) will have identical agreement as to the nature of the ‘building’, as the building is in this case analogous representation of some Subjective aspect of metaphysical investigation, be it the Soul, the Absolute, the nature of totality, etc. This is the grounds, the basis of metaphysics, of the Truth in absolute, dejecting and not withstanding feelings, perspectives, or even the consubstantial consciousness of any temporal man. Here, where space and time have no existence, such that existence in mere empirical selfhood is itself exio-stance (to be outside of ones-Self) where the temporal senses cannot pass to be witness, rather the Witness only; for space and time are merely the coeternal measures of magnitude, of mass (Plotinus, Plato), of being, wherein “all antinomies are manifest and truth is unquestionably relative and personal (person embodied, mere being as is meant by the ‘small self’)”.

That, in further analogy, these men, so enlightened as to the substrate of mere being, would exit the inside, or metaphysical nexus, of this 'building' and attempt to verbally and perspectively relate the nature of what both were in full agreement with in Witnessing to others who would wish forthwith to know, there would be unquestionably nuance, and a differential in lexicon between the two, again "nothing is known except thru the modality (language, communication, expressions etc.) of the Knower"; however the Truth, in metaphysics is not, has never been, nor ever will be relative, empirically subjective. That the communication as dictated by language, time, and place by the Expositor of metaphysics (if he be wise in so relating it, and not a false-knower; as is commonly the case of those who flaunt themselves as wise and knowing of some aspect of metaphysics but in true are not but a fool who desires undeserved acknowledgements and praise from those all the more-so foolish than himself) differs between person to person is, on the contrary to view of the myopic many, not an affirmation of (as they've convinced themselves) the relativistic nature of the Truth in the subject-matter of Metaphysics, which regardless of source of same (Greek, Indian, etc.) takes no stock in empirical experiences, perspectives, the senses, in whole or in part. Metaphysics deals only with the realm posterior to antinomies, and relativistic temporal nuances wherein there can be no doubt, that when known with gnosis (Noetic Knowledge, not meant empirical and relative mere knowledge) that the Truth in and of Metaphysics is devoid of deviation inherent to faulty senses of empirical man where truth is indeed relative. The impossibility of nuance in illuminating metaphysics to others as is necessitated by language, voice, and text has utterly no bearing on the fact that, regarding metaphysics, relativity, perspective, etc. have been superseded and the Truth, be it as pertains the soul or the Absolute, in and of itself has neither perspective nor nuance as attributes of itself.

## **The Traditionalist Truth Seeker**

### **copyright Ken Wheeler**

Nearly 100% of all those who, later in life of their own independent and free will, came to a new religion, or to religion for the first time have gravitated to that very same faith via personal convictions and/or personal likes/dislikes; this error is grand and only borne of ignorances. A true Platonic truth seeker does not gravitate towards religious beliefs or dogmas because those same religious systems are personally attractive, but rather, thru logical and abductive examination. A certain position is reflective of what is true as a model for totality and the furthest position from absolute absurdity (such as Creationist views of a sentient being as the Absolute, or the other extreme, Nihilism/Atheism).

One undeniable fact of the cosmos is its incredibly complexity, both biological and inanimate; the only contention lies, amongst all religions and non-religious materialistic views, is the nexus for this limitless complexity. While the creationist illogically posits a divine and sentient hand at the helm of said creation, the nihilist/atheist in equal ignorance posits random happenstance for its appearance. With the countless plethora of 'faiths' (blind), and religions which lie at either end of antinomy's spectrum, and in between these extremes, humans window-shop for that faith which many admit 'suits them best', or 'rings personally true', or which 'appeals to them'. Wisdom never plays any part in that which they call their own (view/faith/belief), nor examination. The self-reinforcing delusion of mankind's religions is not one based in truth or wisdom, but in comfort, or respect that it is the inheritance of their parents and forefathers, or some other likewise illegitimate reason.

The genuine truth-seeking Platonist, be he an Indian Advaita-Vedanta Monist, or a Neoplatonist is equally pleased if he is proven wrong, either by the wits and wisdom of another in refutation & debate, or by his own hands thru the expansion of wisdom, for both ends only serves to bring this noble truth-seeker closer the truth. Either self-refutation or an increase in wisdom brings one closer the truth and the true noble desires this above all else.

Those ignorant demons, the common and profane manyfolk, will cleave with their hearts and souls to untruths, which many times they themselves know to be untrue, but for no other reason that "they were born into this faith/belief", or an equally ignorant sentimentalism. Close-minded religiosity is based in a comfort, a delusion which is hard to break and enforced by ignorances which are never countered or eliminated in the life of the profane manyfolk. Pythagoras, Plato, Plotinus, Gotama, authors of the Upanishads, and few others were genuine truth seekers the wise emulated with all their being. Wisdom cannot be handed to another via book or word, but the insight which only comes from an unquenchable desire for wisdom and uncovering the truth of genuine being which lies under and above the façade of empirical being, this consubstantial puppet fashioned in the winds of time and which is rented but for a while and is lost again in the winds of time.

The disobjectification (synthesis, epistrophe, samadhi, assimilation) which culminates in liberation self-granted by the sage who bears the noble sword of wisdom is something far far more rare than any could imagine in this land of lemmings who use and cleave to false religions which brings only placebo comforts to those same profane and common manyfolk who are the zombies of samsara, the walking dead in the land of the Subjective light which is never seen by those same whose will is always directed into the dark of the objective and temporal world of flux and reflux.